



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/316,897

05/20/1999

ANAND RAMAKRISHNA

111399.01

8450

69316 7590 04/08/2009

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
ONE MICROSOFT WAY  
REDMOND, WA 98052

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/08/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DBOUTON@MICROSOFT.COM  
vffiling@microsoft.com  
stevensp@microsoft.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/316,897	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAMAKRISHNA, ANAND	
	<b>Examiner</b> Maikhanh Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maikhanh Nguyen. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Chris Culberson (Applicant's representative). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 01 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Microsoft and Wies et al. (US 6125385).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A proposed amendment was discussed. Applicant described the differences between the claim invention and the prior art of record. The Examiner agreed to consider applicant's arguments/ amendments when a formal response to the Office Action is received.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Maikhanh Nguyen/ Examiner, Art Unit 2176	/Laurie Ries/ Primary Examiner
--	-----------------------------------